

VOLUME 15

NUMBER 4

PRICE 7½p

MAY 15 1974

Christian Order



Summary of Contents for April, 1974

THE CHURCH 2000

Michael Davies

THE OLD MASS

The Editor

FAIRPLAY FOR THE CONSUMER

J. M. Jackson

BIBLE READINGS

Francis Fenn, S.J.

BY WHAT AUTHORITY?

The Editor

ABORTION PROTEST
MASS RALLY
AND
SILENT MARCH OF WITNESS

SUNDAY, APRIL 28th., 1974

1.45 p.m. Hyde Park,
LONDON, W.1.

All enquiries to the Organisers:

SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF UNBORN
CHILDREN,

Hon. Sec., at 47, Eaton Place, London, S.W.1.

Phone: 01 995 5790.

Please be there.

Contents

Page	
194	BY WHAT AUTHORITY? <i>The Editor</i>
197	READINGS AT MASS <i>Francis Fenn, S.J.</i>
200	THE CHURCH 2,000 <i>Michael Davies</i>
230	FAIRPLAY FOR THE CONSUMER <i>J. M. Jackson</i>
238	THE OLD MASS 4. LITURGY, SACRIFICE AND DOCTRINE <i>The Editor</i>
251	ANY QUESTIONS? <i>William Lawson, S.J.</i>
255	BOOK REVIEWS

monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

If You Change Your Address :
Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLME 15

APRIL, 1974

NUMBER 4

By What Authority?

THE EDITOR

THERE is, at present, a widespread feeling that those to whom we Catholics looked formerly for guidance appear no longer to be really in full control of the situation in the Church. One has the impression that our spiritual leaders are without the confidence that led them only recently to set authoritative guide-lines in matters of Faith and morals and — on the rare occasions when it was appropriate and necessary — comment on the broader issues of the day. The impression now — especially, I am afraid, with regard to the Bishops — is of men looking over their shoulder, anxious not to be out of step with their Episcopal Conference, interpreting collegiality in practice as conformity to a lowest common denominator of episcopal agreement, as opposed to the individual leadership of each bishop within his own diocese, in loyalty to the teaching authority of the Church, which was the case in days gone by.

Almost inevitably, under such circumstances, the way would appear to have been cleared for something close to a take-over by policy-making bodies and boards, commissions and committees, with “experts” in charge and the role of the individual bishop reduced, almost without his knowing it, to that of executor or, more usually, passive spectator of their policies. And, in view of the fact that most of the “experts” appear to be influenced

heavily by the secularized, process-theology of the present day, we should expect to find many of them well to the left in their social and political outlook, permissive in their approach to ecumenism, way out and man-centred with regard to liturgy and doctrine. And this, indeed, would appear to be the case. Inevitably, therefore, the policies formulated by these "experts" are progressive in doctrine and morals, left-wing in politics and social practice. Yet, tragically, their views tend to be regarded increasingly as those of the official Church; so that what we have at present, in fact if not in theory, is the rule of the Faithful not by the Bishops, but by committees and commissions composed mostly of liberal and left-wing Catholics, who claim to speak on behalf of the mass of the Faithful as their representatives, which they are certainly not, and whose views, because apparently unopposed at episcopal level, tend to be taken as coming officially from the Church, which appears increasingly as ruled and represented by a progressive few whose views are in no way those of the majority of Catholics in this country. Small wonder that the majority are not merely fed up and angry, but increasingly bitter at what they think of as their betrayal by the Bishops of England and Wales. They are tired of the present policy of the Progressive Establishment, which is that of sparing the shepherds and striking the flock. By what authority, they ask, do these usurpers rule? When are our Bishops going to uphold publicly and for all the world to see the Old Faith, which is that of Our Fathers who died for it? The question so far has remained unanswered.

Thus it is, if one may take the doctrinal angle, that, in the field of catechetics and religious instruction, a man-centred near-humanism is not only being widely taught instead of the Faith, but represented as according with the official policy of the Church. This is done without regard for and in blatant opposition to the wishes of the great majority of Catholic parents in this country. The same applies, to a pronounced extent, to the teaching

of religion in schools and, even, of theology in seminaries and religious houses of study, yet no action appears to be taken by those charged by God with ultimate responsibility for correcting this poisonous state of affairs.

At the same time, in the socio-political field, the "new" secularist theology, so dear to progressive hearts, has degraded the Church's role to that of stimulator of earthly progress, man's camp-follower on his march towards supposed perfect temporal happiness, which is increasingly identified, so ignorantly and so arrogantly, with salvation. The Church, they tell us, must involve herself totally in this massive movement in which alone man finds fulfillment, discovering himself and his secular mission in the dynamic of its evolutionary course, making something of himself at last because caught up to the hilt in its leftward lurch towards a socialist paradise; discarding the last scrap of its outworn "élitism", the Church, they say, must merge with the people and recover total authenticity through the identification of herself with the revolutionary masses in the pursuit of their earthly and egalitarian goal. Out of this comes not merely the image, but I am afraid, what appears to many as the contemporary reality of the Church, whose true mission is essentially transcendent, as allied now with the Left, even with the Marxist in his bogus pursuit of a classless society. Sad though it is to say it, aimless support of the Left is what passes at most levels in the contemporary Church today for social and, if there has to be such a thing, political policy. This is what the unholy labours of little men on big committees has produced; this, I am afraid, is what episcopal inertia, combined with a sham ecclesiastical democracy, has loosed upon us.

It adds up not merely to a piece of nonsense, but a hateful betrayal of the Church's essentially transcendent mission. The time has come now for the nonsense to be stopped, for the bishops of this country to act before it is much too late.

Readings at Mass

FRANCIS FENN, S.J.

THE annual Jewish feast of the Passover (see the first reading on Holy Thursday) was a family affair. It began with the father pronouncing two blessings or praises of God — “grace”, as we say⁽¹⁾. One of them had to do with the feast as a whole, the other with the first cup of wine which was shared among those who were to partake of the meal.

It is in this context that we should read the opening (2,14-18) of St. Luke’s account of the Passion (the longer form) which is heard this year on Palm Sunday. The next two verses record the institution of the Eucharist; or rather the “words of consecration” in the form in which they had come down to Luke and to Paul before him (I Cor 11, 23-25: second reading, Holy Thursday). This liturgical formula differs in some respects from that given by Mark (4,22-24) and Matthew (26,26-27). Both formulas show the interest of the writers in the meal as the first Eucharist rather than as the last or “farewell” supper of Jesus with his disciples; though, as we can see, Luke also preserves this latter tradition, and it is especially strong in John (13-17).

Perhaps because of actual Christian practice, Paul and Luke add that the cup, known to the Jews as the “cup of blessing” (cf. I Cor 10,16), was that shared “after supper” — in the case of the Passover, after the eating of the Paschal lamb, which was preceded by the blessing, breaking and sharing of bread (used by Jesus for his own purpose). But such a “breaking of bread” would have happened whenever Jews gathered together for a meal⁽²⁾, and it is not surprising that when this was transfigured

⁽¹⁾ See the prayers at the offering of the bread and wine at Mass.
⁽²⁾ *The Eucharist in the New Testament*, ed. J. Delorme, p. 22.

by the action of Jesus the specifically Christian meal became known as "the breaking of bread" (Acts 2,42; 20,7). Nor is it surprising that Luke should have given a eucharistic colouring to other meals that he records (9,16;24,30; Acts 27,35).

We may briefly note some other differences between the formulas of Mark-Matthew and Paul-Luke. To the words "This is my body" of the former, the latter adds "given for you; do this as a memorial of me". And "my blood of the covenant" becomes "the new covenant in my blood", though the difference is not great. A covenant, or alliance, should according to Semitic ideas be sealed by the sacrifice of victims, whose blood is called "the blood of the covenant" (Exodus 24,5-8). It was precisely this covenant between Yahweh and Israel at Sinai, as well as the liberation from Egypt (Easter Vigil, third reading), that was commemorated in the feast of the Passover. By adding "my" to "blood" Jesus shows that a new sacrifice would replace the old — as Paul and Luke specify⁽³⁾.

It is worth recalling, in considering the words of Jesus, that "body" meant not merely a part of man (as if distinct from blood or soul), but the whole man in his bodily existence. "Blood" is the life-substance and stands for the living being with blood coursing through its veins, especially when it suffers a violent death. "Jesus, by means of the food he gave them was allowing his disciples to share in the sacrifice of his death"⁽⁴⁾, and hence in his risen life. He was making over to his faithful his whole self and his destiny.

Probably Mark and Matthew did not think it necessary to refer to the command of Jesus to do what he had done: they were doing it, and could only do it by virtue of his authority. It is worth noting that even the Passover was not a mere commemoration. "It was the means by which they (the Jews) associated themselves, as physically as possible, with the event of the Exodus . . . The words which the father of the family spoke over these various dishes to explain their significance gave them in some

way a new power; so much so that, by eating them, the people at table profited anew and in a personal way from the favours received by their fathers"⁽⁵⁾. But when we do what Jesus did "as a memorial" of him, there is actually made present the deliverance from sin and lasting death wrought for us in his Person on Calvary, symbolised by the sacramental bread and wine. At least since the end of the first century this has been called by the Greek word Eucharist (thanksgiving), for by this action we gratefully acknowledge the gift of salvation and make it our own.

Luke records a meal on Easter evening of which Jesus himself partakes (24,41-43), but this has the purpose of convincing his apostles of his reality. They had to be the official witnesses of this before the world (24,48; see also Acts 10,40-41, read on Easter morning). The parallel reading from St. John on April 21 also speaks of the task of the apostles (20,21), but there is no mention of a meal. The contrast in 20,29 is not between seeing and believing: it is between those who have seen the risen Jesus and believed, and that much greater number of believing Christians who have not seen him but rely on apostolic witness (cf. I Peter 1,8). The confession of Thomas "My Lord and my God" is the climax of the whole gospel; as can be seen from the end of the reading, this chapter was originally intended to end the book.

The epilogue (part of which is read on April 28) has been described as an appearance of Jesus which is used to show how he provided for the needs of the Church. The Church is represented first by the 153 fish caught in the net, which "was not broken", and (after breakfast) by the sheep committed to the care of Peter, the manner of whose death is foretold (cf. 10,11; 12,33). The breakfast of bread and fish which Jesus prepares for the hungry fishermen recalls his action, in the same locality, in 6,11; and the Eucharist on which he feeds those who follow him "until he comes" (Luke 12,37).

(3) *op. cit.*, p. 78. (4) *ibid.*, p. 31. (5) pp. 81-82.

Comment has been called for by the Authors of a recent Report entitled "The Church 2000", and published by the Catholic Information Office. Below we print a lengthy comment by an extremely well informed Catholic layman. We trust that the Authors of the Report will give it serious consideration.

The Church 2000

Recipe for Ruin

MICHAEL DAVIES

THE Catholic Information Office has published a pamphlet entitled *The Church 2000*. It purports to contain a "pastoral strategy" which, if implemented, will revitalise the Church in her mission and, the Authors assure us, "even greater days" will lie ahead. Greater days than what? The first requirement for a successful strategy in any sphere is that it should be based on a realistic appraisal of the existing situation and resources. In speaking of the "greater times" ahead the Authors clearly believe that great times are already here; and this alone shows that they are living in a world so divorced from reality that their report is likely to be valueless. They take great pains to show that this is the case and in this respect alone their endeavours are entirely convincing.

"Great Times"?

What is the existing situation — the "great times" the Authors allege we are living in? James Hitchcock has summarised it perfectly in his book *The Decline and Fall*

of *Radical Catholicism*⁽¹⁾. Among the Authors of *The Church 2000* are a number of the "professional" Progressives, who have emerged from the murky recesses in which they lurked prior to Vatican II to plan and proclaim a renewal which they claim is taking place somewhere, but for which not a single tangible shred of evidence has ever been produced. Hitchcock writes:

"Yet the Progressives' hopes for 'renewal' now seem largely chimeric, a grandiose expectation, an attractive theory, but one which has failed of achievement. In the heady days of the Council it was common to hear predictions that the conciliar reforms would lead to a massive resurgence of the flagging Catholic spirit. Laymen would be stirred from their apathy and alienation and would join enthusiastically in apostolic projects. Liturgy and theology, having been brought to life and made relevant, would be constant sources of inspiration to the Faithful. The religious orders, reformed to bring them into line with modernity, would find themselves overwhelmed with candidates who were generous and enthusiastic. The Church would find the number of converts increasing dramatically as it cast off its moribund visage and indeed would come to be respected and influential in wordly circles as it had not been for centuries. In virtually every case the precise opposite of these predictions has come to pass . . . little in the Church seems entirely healthy or promising; everything seems vaguely sick and hollow. No one can predict with any certainty that the Church will have a visible existence by the end of the century (p.22)."

Hitchcock himself is a former liberal who has been honest enough to face the facts. Fr. Louis Bouyer had always been considered well to the fore in the ranks of the "progressive" clergy: he too has had the courage and moral integrity necessary to make a public admission that there has been a disaster and not a renewal. "Unless we are

¹ *The Decline and Fall of Radical Catholicism* by James Hitchcock. 68p, post free. This analysis of the current state of the Church by a disillusioned liberal professor is one of the most valuable and most readable available.

blind," he writes, "we must even state bluntly that what we see looks less like the hoped-for regeneration of Catholicism than its accelerated decomposition" (2). Similar statements have been made by Pope Paul VI, Fr. Henri de Lubac, S.J., and Cardinal Danielou (3). In this country, Cardinal Heenan himself has conceded that, without some form of divine intervention, it seems unlikely that there will be a Church left by the year 2000(4). This list of eminent authorities has been cited to support so obvious a thesis because even to suggest that we might not be in the midst of a glorious and unprecedented renewal, is to incur instant anathematisation for contradicting the first principle of the new progressive "orthodoxy". If challenged on this point, I could (without being happy to do so) produce ample statistics to prove the serious decline in Mass attendance, conversions, vocations, and baptisms; the latter perhaps being the most serious of all because, if it continues to escalate, there will be few young Catholics left to lapse when the year 2000 comes. The problem will not be how to provide schools for Catholic children, but what to do with the empty ones which will be on our hands. There is a marked and unprecedented increase in one respect — that of defections from the priestly and religious life.

Reasons for the Decline

A number of reasons for this decline have been given. Pope Paul considers it due to a widespread refusal to accept the teaching and authority of the magisterium; Cardinal Danielou stresses the new heresy of "horizontalism" — "that is, in Christianity there is seen only the horizontal dimension, the relationship with others, completely elimi-

2 *The Decomposition of Catholicism*, 80p.

3 A very comprehensive selection of these statements is available in the *Dossier on Catechetics* published by *Approaches*. It has now been reprinted for the third time, 20p.

4 *Times Literary Supplement*, 22 Dec., 1973.

nating the vertical dimension; that is, the relationship with God". He warns that, if the Church reduces herself to the status of an adjunct to the social services, she will be "set aside and rightly so, since there have always been Socialists, teachers of morality and organisers of society: they have rendered services but they have never saved anyone". Jacques Maritain defined the malaise as that of "kneeling before the world"⁽⁵⁾. The world is elevated to the status of a deity whose good opinion the Christian must place above all else. The Church is not to pass judgement on the world, but to be judged by the world, and her prime concern must be to be seen by the world as doing what seems right and fitting to the world. James Hitchcock places the blame squarely on the shoulders of the radicals themselves, pointing out that they have attempted to impose a form of élitism on the Catholic community which bears little resemblance to tradition or the Faith of most believers.

Current Crisis in the Church Ignored

These symptoms are manifest throughout *The Church 2000*. The first point to make about the Report is that it completely ignores the current crisis, the accelerating decomposition of the Church, and proposes an intensification of the causes of this decomposition as a prescription for even "geater times". The report is, as Fr. Crane has pointed out, pervaded by "fuzz"⁽⁶⁾. It insists that we must speak to the world "in its own language and idiom", condemns the use of "ecclesiastical jargon", advocates language that is "plain and understandable"; but is written throughout in the most obtuse progressive jargon, which would be unintelligible to those outside the élitist group at which it is aimed. This might well be intentional — for not only does it manifest a total failure to appreciate the current situation of the Church, but it does not contain a single

⁵ *Op. cit.*, Note 3. Sources and more lengthy quotations available.

⁶ *Christian Order*, November 1973.

suggestion from beginning to end which is likely to ameliorate that situation in any respect. This is not meant to imply that much or most of the pamphlet is untrue: in fact, it contains a good deal of truth which is so obvious that it does not need restating and is quite irrelevant to the professed aim of providing a pastoral strategy, which would enable the Church to accomplish her mission more effectively during the coming decades. It states, for example: "First and foremost a sense of mission must be present in every member of the Church. Given this sense of mission then a great deal of the strategy and most of the tactical organisation needed by the Church will come into being by its own impetus. Without it any form of strategy will fail and the best forms of organisation will become moribund" (Para 37). The effect upon this country if even one or two per cent of the Catholic population were filled with a real sense of mission is too staggering to contemplate — if the entire Catholic population manifested such a spirit, the conversion of Britain would be a matter of months! The Authors display a particular talent for such observations: what they do *not* do is provide the least inkling of how such a spirit of mission is likely to be evoked. What is certain is that the implemenation of the Report's proposals would serve to stifle what spirit of mission remains in those Catholics, who consider that this involves something more than a perpetually escalating plethora of commissions and committees which, as Cardinal Heenan has rightly pointed out, are stifling the work of the Church in this country⁽⁷⁾.

Ignorance of Mission of the Church

The Authors never make clear precisely what they mean by the mission of the Church: they define it as proclaiming the Gospel and giving it effect "in a particular place at a particular time" (Para 12). There is a

⁷ *The Universe*, 15 Sept., 1972.

good deal about preaching the Gospel and preaching the Word; but it is about the content of this Gospel and Word that clarity is needed. The Catholic Gospel is well summarised in the very first papal allocution (Acts 2). It is a genuine call to action and St. Peter is very clear as to what this action is: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit". Those who responded to this invitation would be rewarded with eternal happiness in heaven. Those who did not would be condemned to hell. This has been the straightforward Gospel message preached throughout the world since that time. There is nothing to indicate that the authors of *The Church 2000* accept this straightforward message in its straightforward terms. Reading between the lines indicates that they do not. Unpopular though the attitude may be, Christianity is and must remain (if it is to remain Christian) essentially an other-worldly religion. The Christian is a sojourner, a wayfarer in this world. His eyes are fixed on the heavenly Jerusalem, his true home. He is an exile here, an exile in a basically hostile world, which he must be in but *not* of; if he were of the world it would love him: because he is not it hates him. Being hated by the world is a characteristic of the true Christian. The world will hate him as it hates the God he serves but, like God who so loved the world that He sent His only Son to redeem it, the Christian does not hate the world in return. He is to be the light of the world but, as long as the world refuses to accept its redemption, he cannot be identified with it. Anxiety about affairs of the world turns one from God. *The Church 2000* is as vague about what it means by the world as about what it means by the Gospel. In the New Testament sense, the world under its ruler the devil, is a personification of evil forces: it will not receive its Redeemer and will remain hostile to Him and to His Church until it is judged by Him at the second coming. The Christian is not to seek to gain

the approval of the world but the approval of God; but this involves a concern for the spiritual and material needs of his *individual* fellow men, and it is above all in this respect that he will be judged. This is also a simple and straightforward concept which has not changed since old-testament times, e.g. Isaiah 58; 6/8. However, while *The Church 2000* has a great deal to say in regard to the material needs of men, it is far more reticent in regard to such truths as sin, repentance, heaven, and hell! It comes very close to Cardinal Danielou's portrait of horizontal Christianity. Whatever the eyes of its Authors are fixed on, it most certainly is not heaven!

Gospel and Adapted Gospel

It is clearly implied that the simple Gospel of Acts 2 is not adequate for the "changing world" of today. The "changing world" is one of the clichés which most obsesses the Authors of this pamphlet (Heraclitus noticed that the world was changing and this fact has not escaped several other thinkers since his day). Mgr. Philip Hughes has noted that, from her very beginnings, the Church has been plagued with heresies inspired by a desire to "adapt" the Church to the world of the time⁽⁸⁾. Adaption and surrender would seem to be synonymous in Church history. The Authors of *The Church 2000* claim that the Church must "renew its understanding of the Gospel, and re-examine what is happening around it in the light of the Gospel" (para 12). We are called to reassess the nature and mission of the Church "in the light of our own circumstances. We have to do it, not in the security of the time-worn structures with which we are so familiar, but in the rapidly changing and unfamiliar world of today" (para 17). The great reforms and renewals in the Church have been the work of great saints; it would be interesting to have examples of similar sentiments pointed out in their writings!

8 *A Short History of the Catholic Church*, Chapter 1.

The nature of this adapted "Gospel" is made explicit in para 19 of the Report. It is the epitomisation of the horizontalism condemned by Cardinal Danielou. "So the Church must be in the world and *working with the world* to produce a new and better society" (para 19). "Christians dare not allow the world to take shape — or to take its unity — without them. This would not only be a betrayal of the Church but a betrayal of the world *which the Church is called to serve*" (para 22). As Fr. Crane has pointed out, the Church seems to spend a great deal of her time today "echoing the popular discontents of a secularist world. Having sought to contribute a presence to the world, she has been downgraded to the status of a camp-follower"⁽⁹⁾.

The Report and Ecumenism

The Report explains that, as the mission of the Church, i.e. helping to produce a newer and better society, is the kind of life "to which every Christian is called" the "pastoral strategy of the Church must be ecumenical" (para 20). The "many changes in the world", which so obsess the Authors, "demand an approach in the mission of the Church which must include non-Roman Christians". As a prime task of the Church is to bring these "non-Roman Christians" from the darkness of heresy to the truth and unity of the one, true, Church founded by Christ upon St. Peter, it is hard to see (despite the "many changes in the world") how this objective can be achieved by co-operating with them. The Church, claims this pamphlet, can only fulfil its work "in so far as it is seen to exist for the world and not for itself. The divisions among Christians lead the world to think of the Church as turned in on itself and uninterested in what goes on 'outside'". This statement deserves to be queried on several points. Firstly, it seems to confuse *the* Church with the totality of Christian denominations. The Church herself is not

⁹ *Op. cit.*, Note 6.

divided — those Christians who refuse to accept her authority are outside her visible unity; but the Church is always *One*, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic. Secondly, if by “the world” the Authors mean the generality of non-church-going citizens, who are indifferent if not hostile to any form of organised religion, there is not one shred of evidence to indicate that divisions among Christians are an impediment to their evangelisation. Of the hundred or more families who live in my own road not more than a dozen attend any form of worship on Sundays. I am quite certain that, if every Christian denomination united tomorrow, the Church-going figure would not increase by one; yet the Authors of this Report assert quite blandly that our lack of full unity “remains the great barrier to a complete pastoral strategy. We must work more closely together. For it is only *in working together for the good of the world* (italics mine), that Christian communities can persuade the world to say, not simply, ‘See how these Christians love one another’ but, ‘See how these Christians love us’”.

We have a very cheerful but very “unevangelised” milkman whom, I regret to say, we have not yet attempted to evangelise — perhaps displaying an inadequate sense of mission. My wife, who has a very keen sense of the affairs of this world, spends most of her short interview with him each Saturday calculating whether there has been yet another of those errors in our account which are invariably in his favour. Should she be able to inform him one Saturday that all the Christian communities had united and that the great barrier to his conversion had now been removed I would be most surprised to see him standing at my side in church the next day or any other day. Anyone who cares to visualise the impact complete union between Christians would make upon his own milkman, postman, baker or the girl who serves him in Woolworths, will certainly reach the same conclusion. Judging by the jargon of *The Church 2000*, its Authors would be unable to communicate with, let alone convert such people.

The Basic Defect

This obsession with ecumenism is typical of the basic defect which distorts the thinking not only of the Authors of this pamphlet, but progressive Catholics in general; they tend to identify their interests (obsessions might be a better word) with the wishes of the Church in general. "I want" is equivalent to "the laity wants". They inform us that the spread of information brings "a desire on the part of people to be involved in the making of decisions" (para 18). This is a popular concept among politicians at present; "participation" is very much the vogue cliché today. It would indeed, be a good thing for society if more people took an interest in every aspect of community affairs and did wish to participate. The fact is that very few do. Evidence of this was printed in the *Evening Standard* of 23 November, 1973. It reported despondency on the part of the Westminster City Council because so few people had turned up to twelve public meetings they had organised "to hear the voice of the people". This report states that: "The Council are disappointed by attendances at the meetings which they have striven hard to publicise by means of posters and loud-speaker vans. Familiar faces from local conservation societies have tended to turn up over and over again". This is not a criticism of these members of local conservation societies; they have an objective which they wish to realise and are to be commended for their zeal in attaining it: in a similar manner, Communists are able to obtain so many influential positions in the trade-union movement because they take the trouble to turn up at meetings. What *would* be unrealistic would be for those in authority to assume that the views of the zealous conservationists or Communist trade-union delegates really do represent the views and aspirations of the average citizen of Westminster or the average trade unionist. As a working class teacher from a working class family living in a working class parish I am only too well aware of how ludicrous was the impression, given some weeks

ago in some left-wing publications, that the workers of Britain were seething with anger at the recent coup in Chile and that, had recruiting centres for a new International Brigade been opened, they would have been besieged by dedicated proletarian admirers of the late marxist-masonic President of Chile. When Louis XIV said "L'état, c'est moi!" there was a great deal of truth in his assertion. When the Catholic Progressive states "L'Eglise, c'est moi", or "The laity, c'est moi" we should all be able to have a good laugh, but for the fact that even some of our bishops seem to accept such statements at face value.

Tactics of Elitist Pressure

A typical example of the tactics of élitist pressure groups is their campaign for Communion in the hand. Their desire for this practice is presumably based on the principle that the very act of changing any established practice justifies itself; for them any change is better than no change. No evidence has been produced to indicate that even a fraction of one per cent of the laity want this practice, although experience shows that the majority can be induced to accept it when imposed — a very different matter. In another large working-class parish near my own, with a Mass attendance of over 2,000 each Sunday, a survey by the parish priest revealed that not a single parishioner wished to receive Holy Communion in the hand; yet, at their 1973 Low Week meeting, a majority of the English and Welsh bishops had already succumbed to the pressure campaign and voted for the official introduction of the practice, apparently against the clear wishes of Pope Paul VI as expressed in *Memoriale Domini*⁽¹⁰⁾. The necessary two-thirds majority has not yet been achieved; but it may well be in the very near future unless those who do not wish the Church in this country to be governed

¹⁰ The full text of *Memoriale Domini* and a fully documented article explaining the nature of the campaign to impose this on the Faithful is available at 6p post inc.

in accordance with the whims of a handful of Progressives make an effort to put forward their views as frequently and as forcefully as they do. Indeed, where orthodox Catholics make such an effort, the results can be dramatic. The meeting of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in the U.S.A. on 13 November, 1973 voted decisively against Communion in the hand — so decisively, according to Dale Francis in the *National Catholic Register* of November 25, "that it is unlikely ever to surface again Nowhere in the United States may any priest give Communion in the hand". Yet a previous vote had revealed a majority, but not the necessary two-thirds majority, in favour. The progressive press had confidently predicted that this majority would be achieved at the November meeting of the U.S. Bishops. However, a vigorous campaign by orthodox Catholics was so successful that a good number of bishops who had voted previously in favour of Communion in the hand, changed their minds and a previous vote of 54% in favour of Communion in the hand changed to a vote of 54% against. This impressive achievement should be considered seriously by those who claim that there is never any point in writing to their bishop as "nothing will be done".

Another example occurred in the *Catholic Gazette* of October, 1973. Mr. Kevin Muir, Secretary (full-time paid) of the Laity Commission, in an article explaining what good value we get for the money expended on his Commission, demonstrates "The Laity, c'est moi" concept to perfection. He is also one of the Authors of *The Church 2000* and, as the pamphlet and his article make clear, he "has a thing" about the laity being consulted concerning the selection of new bishops. It hardly needs saying that, once again, there is unlikely to be a fraction of one per cent of the laity at large who wish to be consulted or would be competent to pronounce on the merits of priests from parishes other than their own, including priests from outside their dioceses. Mr. Muir felt obliged to initiate action in this respect "because

of the groundswell of opinion that seemed to be building up." There's richness for you! (What a great commission man Chadband would have been!) "The groundswell of opinion that seemed to be building up" — well was it building up or did it only seem to be; and how did it manifest itself? Does Mr. Muir have any evidence to produce; has his office had to be expanded to provide storage space for the files bulging with letters by the ten thousand from zealous laymen wanting "to be involved in the making of decisions"? Might not an investigation reveal that what Mr. Muir means by a "groundswell of opinion" is any gimmick which appeals to him and to a handful of his chums? Incidentally, widespread consultation on the appointment of bishops is one of the key points in the pastoral strategy which *The Church 2000* insists will initiate the dynamic programme resulting in "even greater days"!

The Iron Law of Oligarchies

The laity will, of course, be consulted through their pastoral Councils, i.e. through Mr. Muir and his ilk who dominate these institutions. Bishops who accept, or profess to accept, that such bodies really do represent the laity at large ignore what Hitchcock defines as "a modern sociological commonplace — the Iron Law of Oligarchies, which states that élite groups of individuals will always dominate communities and institutions, even those with apparently democratic structures". (p.40). He accuses Progressives of using a "democratic rhetoric to mask an élitist conception of religious reform" (p.48).

The Authors of *The Church 2000* are not simply content to insist that what they want is what the Church wants, they even claim to speak for mankind in general. The provision of more deacons is another recipe for the evangelisation of society. "The grace of the diaconate is present in the commission of Christ the Deacon to his followers. And now the Church and the world are calling for it

to be made available to them" (para 167). Well, this call has been coming in very muted tones where most of us are concerned. I was in complete ignorance of the fact that it was being made until I read this Report. I have yet to meet a single priest or layman who had heard this *cri de coeur* from the Church and the world. My wife confirms that while she receives frequent requests from our milkman for her to buy cream, eggs, butter, and (strangely enough) orange juice, he has yet to request that our Church makes deacons available for him. The report informs us in most solemn tones that a deacon working as a "rodent operative" (i.e. old rat-catcher writ large) will "make the serving Church present" (para 154)! An original idea; but one which will hardly necessitate the erection of crush barriers outside our churches to stem the rush of new converts. The deacon will not, of course, confine himself to catching rats. He will receive the gifts which the Faithful bring to the altar at Mass. "This symbolises his diaconal function of inspiring and organising the total offering which the Christian must make of himself to God and to others" (para 157). It is far from cynical to observe that this is hardly likely to bring back the hundreds of thousands of Catholics who cease attending Mass each year.

The Report and the Bishops

The section concerning bishops reveals more in what it does not say than what it does. In his appeal to the bishops of the world to be fearless in defending orthodoxy, Pope Paul makes it clear that protecting and passing on the sacred Deposit of Faith should be the prime concern of a truly *pastoral* bishop at a moment when the basic truths of our Faith are being undermined from within the Church, even, as the Pope states explicitly, by some bishops themselves who come forward with a travesty of the truth on their lips⁽¹¹⁾. *The Church 2000* expresses concern not

¹¹ A lengthy extract is available in *The Scandal of Maynooth*, published by Approaches, p. 2. 15p.

that the bishop should insist that "Christian doctrine" is orthodox, but that he must take the lead in presenting it "in a manner which takes account of the problems of the day in dialogue with those who do not believe . . . (Para 62)". If it is pointed out that Progressives have hailed the *New (Dutch) Catechism* as the work which presents Catholic doctrine in the manner most suited to the problems of the day, then the implications of this passage, and those cited earlier regarding a new understanding of the Gospel and the abandonment of "time-worn structures", become very clear.

Bishops are instructed "to trust all the other members of the Church in their work for the spread of the Kingdom. People need to know that their leaders trust them and continue to trust them even in the mistakes which they make". It is "a task of leadership to correct mistakes without questioning the good will of those who make them and without harming their morale" (para 66).

It would have been useful here had the Authors explained what they mean by making mistakes. Is it "a mistake" to teach heresy persistently and publicly? Is it "a mistake" to write letters to the national press stating that you refuse to accept the teaching of *Humanae Vitae*? One of the Authors of the Report, Fr. Michael Winter, did this. Perhaps the bishops wish to have their pastoral strategy directed by such a priest, as they feel that a man who knows better than the Pope in a matter of this sort must certainly know better than they do. Orthodox priests and laymen will consider his inclusion in the team which drew up the book a source of scandal. Have the heresies of Hans Kung been a mistake? Should he be allowed to go on making them or is the fact that he is still allowed to do so with impunity turning the authority of the Church into a laughing stock and causing the faithful to lose heart, as Fr. Crane claims? Do not the Faithful have the right to trust their bishops to administer "the chop" (to quote Fr. Crane again) to those who make it

clear that they no longer accept the Faith⁽¹²⁾? Pope Paul insists that the Catholic Faith is a "package deal" — we do not pick and choose what we will and will not accept (the root meaning of heretic is one who *chooses*). As Catholics, we do not believe what we want to believe but what God wants us to believe — and the mass of the Faithful have a *right* to insist that their bishop teaches, and only allows to be taught, what he knows is authentic Catholic doctrine approved by the magisterium of the Church and not by a new, self-appointed magisterium comprising a woolly-minded coterie of progressive clerics and their lay hangers-on.

Among the other qualities a bishop must possess, according to *The Church 2000*, are "the sound judgement and moral stature to give and receive criticism with justice, humility, and a sense of humour. He must have a sound knowledge of theology. He will need a working knowledge of world, national, and local affairs" . . . He must not be so old "as to prefer the quiet of the fireside to the excitement of action" (para 74). What action? Do bishops really need "a working knowledge of world, national and local affairs"? How many of our bishops possess such a knowledge at the moment? How many of the canonised bishops of the past possessed it? Could a bishop fulfil his essential tasks if he made a serious attempt to keep abreast of world, national, and local affairs? Once again it is worth pointing out that the need for him to be both orthodox and determined to enforce orthodoxy is not mentioned.

Paranoia and Progressives

Those who know anything of the background of some of those who wrote this Report will find it impossible not to be amused by their pompous admonition to the bishops to accept criticism with humility and a sense of humour. James Hitchcock comments that; "In the post-conciliar years the Progressives have become increasingly radical

¹² *Op. cit.*, Note 6.

and also increasingly paranoid. They manifest an extreme reluctance to examine honestly their own attitudes and their own history and a corresponding compulsion to blame all failures on the 'establishment' " (p.25). In the issue of the *Catholic Gazette* already cited, Mr. Kevin Muir speaks bitterly concerning those who have pointed out with perfect accuracy that, where the good of the Church in England and Wales is concerned, his Commission is a total waste of money. In the same issue, another of the Authors, Fr. Michael Hollings, adopts his more-in-sorrow-than-in-anger technique to denounce those concerned to defend orthodoxy. It is worth examining what he writes here and what he has written elsewhere as an insight into the type of person who produced *The Church 2000*; this will indicate the type of thinking behind the Report and the manner in which it should be interpreted if it is to conform with their wishes. (If this type of process can be applied to the Bible it is surely not irreverent to apply it to progressives.) "For the world and especially the Church in the world today", writes Fr. Hollings, "is ridden with fear, and it is vitally necessary if the Christ-life is to develop in Christians that we should all live by faith, be filled with the Holy Spirit, and so radiate the perfect love which casts out fear."

"Unfortunately, because the climate which has followed Vatican II has been a climate in this country which has the autumnal bite of episcopal reticence, the 'whole hoggers' who want to go ahead with the implementation of Vatican II, get featured as 'dangerous men'. There is a whiff of heresy about when very ordinary implementations are urged; there is doubt as to orthodoxy when any question is raised which might eventually undermine the established status quo at any and all levels of Church life. Sadly enough, there are those about today who lead witch hunts to expose 'dangerous trends', using all their energy negatively. This is doubly sad, because it is so easy to induce fear and bewilderment, so hard to create a spirit of courage, hope and vision".

This provides a classic example of the humility and sense of humour with which Progressives respond to criticism. There is, of course, in the above, no attempt made to state what aspect of Vatican II anyone has prevented Progressives from implementing. Fr. Hollings gives Communion in the hand in his parish. This, of course, is forbidden but he presumably does so in a spirit of courage, hope and vision which sets him above the lesser clergy, who do not enjoy the support of the progressive establishment. But Communion in the hand has not even the remotest connection with implementing Vatican II. Similarly, his congregation are able to go up to the altar and help themselves to the chalice — a totally illegal practice. A report in the *Catholic Herald* of 30 November, 1973 refers to further acts of contestation against the authority of the Pope perpetuated at house Masses in Father Hollings, parish. It is far from “negative” to criticise unorthodox catechetics or liturgical abuses — it is a very *positive* step to defend and preserve our Catholic heritage. In an article in *The Catholic Herald*, Father Hollings informed his readers that the light of Christ “flickers in midwinter; it is obscured in mental illness and despair, it sinks in despond at the voice of the establishment, it rises to high gusts at the words of Pope John, Bonhoeffer, Quoist, Suenens, Bloom, Butler or Helder Camara”⁽¹³⁾. What on earth does this gibberish mean — leaving aside the mixing of metaphors; (how can a light rise to high gusts?) — what sort of mentality is it that links the wholly orthodox and traditional Pope John with a formal, shallow heretic like Hans Kung? The idea that our bishops should ask a man with such a list of heroes to tell them what their pastoral strategy should be is enough to “induce fear and bewilderment” in anyone who loves the Church.

And what does the reverend gentleman mean by “the establishment”? In the *de facto* world of the Church 1973 there is no more establishment figure than himself. The

13. 20 October '72.

Catholic press is open to him; his courageous, hopeful and visionary smile is directed at participants in innumerable conferences, study days, commissions, and committees. Even *The Guardian*, the very voice of "the world" in the sense condemned in the New Testament, finds that the views of Fr. Hollings fit in perfectly with its own. On November 3, 1973, its prosperous and ultra establishment readers were treated to an article written by and in praise of the tolerant and open-minded Fr. Hollings, depicting him praying with hundreds of Muslims in a Catholic school playground to mark the end of Ramadan. It put me very much in mind of Toad's triumphant song of self-praise after his escape from prison in *The Wind in the Willows*. Fr. Hollings is a little more subtle, but he lacks Toad's panache and joie de vivre.

Father Hollings and the Establishment

What, in fact, Father Hollings means by "the Establishment" is, presumably the body in opposition to his self-confessed heroes, such as Hans Kung. This body is, of course, the magisterium of the Catholic Church, which is the voice of Christ speaking to us in the way in which He guaranteed it would. Yet Fr. Hollings is planning our pastoral strategy! As has been mentioned already, among the advantages of belonging to the de facto establishment of which Fr. Hollings is so distinguished a pillar, is that he can rely on it to print and sell anything he cares to write. Robert Hoyt, editor of the *National Catholic Reporter*, voice of the progressive establishment in the U.S.A., has admitted that "... liberal theologians dominate the public prints, the catechetical training centres, the publishing houses, the professional associations, much of the Catholic bureaucracy; they praise each other's books, award each other contracts, jobs, awards and perquisites". The exact parallel in Britain can be illustrated by referring to a book of prayers which Fr. Hollings published recently. Two examples will provide an insight into the Hollings

style of spirituality.

"Can't you stop this bloody war, Lord? If you can't I don't know who can. And if you don't want to I can't see how you are good. It's up to you to show me, Lord. It's more than I can grasp".

"Lord, I'm hopping mad; that man's crashed into my car. Stop me from telling him what I think of him! It won't do any good to let fly at him, but I want to. Lord, why can't you keep fools like him off the road?" The Westminster Religious Education Centre enthusiastically recommend this book to schools in the Archdiocese and the C.T.S. accorded it a full window display.

The Report and the Liturgy

There is a great deal about the liturgy in *The Church 2000* and, at least in this respect, there is a note of welcome realism. It does not pretend that the liturgical reforms have been effective or accepted with enthusiasm. In certain parishes, "there is a liturgy which appears as a real celebration" (no orthodox Catholic needs telling what this means!), but generally "Priests and people accept reform of the rubrics and other changes because they have been decreed from on high. But they have little understanding of their meaning. Some they welcome, others they detest, many they seem to receive with indifference. They pick and choose without regard to the overall pattern of renewal"(para 107). There is, in fact, *no* overall pattern of renewal and the Authors of the report have clearly not considered that the liturgical reforms might, in themselves, be defective. They are themselves the production of an elitist group, the "liturgical establishment". Archbishop R. J. Dwyer of Portland, Oregon has pointed out that the Council Fathers made their greatest mistake in allowing the implementation of the reform decreed by Vatican II to get into its hands⁽¹⁴⁾. Fr. Bouyer, who was in the van

¹⁴ *The Tidings*, July 9, 1971.

of the liturgical movement, wrote a book entitled *The Liturgy Revived* which prophesied the glorious era that was to arise from the implementation of the Decree on the Liturgy. In his latest book, he points out that the reform itself has been a complete betrayal not only of what the Council ordered but of the whole liturgical movement (15). One of the best known figures in the British liturgical establishment, Fr. J. D. Crichton, now concedes that there has been no renewal in the liturgy. ". . . apart from small pockets of activity, Church life in this country is stagnant. It lacks a sense of adventure. It is terrified of experimentation in any department. It has an extremely weak sense of mission"(16). Apart from the admission regarding the stagnation of Church life in this country, this statement is interesting as another manifestation of the attitude which characterises *The Church 2000*. To consider the liturgy of the Mass a proper subject for "experimentation and adventure" displays a total failure to appreciate its true nature and purpose; and it is also an excellent example of the defence mechanism which Progressives set up to protect themselves from appreciating the consequences of their actions. The abysmal state of the liturgy in Britain (and the Western world generally) is the result of the reforms, the adventures, and the experiments of men like Fr. Crichton; yet they continue to insist that the real reason for the collapse lies in this, that there is not enough of what they advocate. Once again it is a case of "What I want is what the Church wants".

In a speech in praise of *The Church 2000*, reported in the *Catholic Herald* of November 30, 1973, Bishop Guazelli, another of its Authors, claimed that the Report showed more than "simple concern for social problems" because it showed "that the inspiration for Christian activity was the worshipping community at Mass. Mass was the point from which the Christian community could go out reinvigorated to give society a new vision in a disinte-

15 *Op. cit.*, Note 2.

16 *Catholic Herald*, 23 Nov., 1973.

grating world". The Report does state this, but, as usual, does not give the least indication as to how or why the Mass is likely to do this when the liturgy in use at present is failing even to hold the present congregations. The Mass attendance statistics for Bishop Guazelli's own archdiocese since the liturgical "renewal" began make very depressing reading. Ironically, on the very same page of the *Catholic Herald* which contained the report of Bishop Guazelli's speech, an article by Fr. Charles-Roux entitled "So Called Renewal" asked a question which is very pertinent to the need for the Mass to inspire the congregation: "Could it not be that the mere daring to tamper with the Sacred Mystery of the Mass in the perfection of form it had reached and kept over at least four centuries, turned out to be as fatal to the Church as it was to any Jew tampering with the Ark of old?" "To interfere with the public rites", wrote Confucius, "is to touch the very fabric of government". If the Authors of this report had their way there would be a lot more tampering and a lot more interfering with the public rites! Presumably, because this is what they want, it is what the Church wants! Have they ever asked themselves if it is what God wants?

One sphere in which there has certainly been a "groundswell" of concern among the laity is that of Catholic education. But, as has been pointed out, a groundswell of opinion does not become a groundswell in virtue of the number of those whose opinion is represented; it can be recognised as such by the Laity Commission only if it conforms to one of the gimmicks currently preoccupying Mr. Muir and his chums. There is ample documentation available to prove *conclusively* that the so-called "new" catechetics are quite incompatible with *Catholic* catechetics⁽¹⁷⁾. Attempts have been made to explain away criticisms of the new teaching as no more than parental ignorance of new methods. *The Church 2000* adopts this approach. Ordinary Catholics, the plebs of the Church

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, Note 3 and also *Dossier on Catechetics*, 10p post inc., *The Subversion Continues*, 15p post inc., *Out of their own Mouths*, 5p. post inc.

where the Authors of this Report are concerned, "want Catholic schools — though they may be rather dubious about modern methods of teaching — but ignore opportunities to find out about either" (Para 109). If the Authors have bothered to read any of the criticisms of the "new" catechetics produced by *Approaches*, the Pro Fide Movement, or in such journals as *Christian Order*, they must know that this statement is completely false. If they have not read them, then, in condemning those whose complaints they have not studied, they are manifesting the prime characteristic of the Progressive — complete contempt for those who refuse to accept every last jot and tittle of his meritricious new anti-theology. While they have not been able to find any evidence for the widespread concern about inadequate and unorthodox catechetics, they have noted with approval a wish for ecumenical schools "in line with the general desire to share christian resources" (para 188). Presumably, if we wish to find the meaning of "a general desire" in the *Dictionary of Progressive Jargon* the entry would read: See "groundswell of opinion".

In an interesting slip of super-Freudian dimensions, the Authors do admit that the type of layman active in "the particular apostolate of the laity" which meets with their approval, is no more than 2-3%. "So only a minority of the laity has received the call from its pastors to exercise the rights and duties of members of the Church". This is a gratuitous assumption of breath-taking impertinence — so a Catholic is only exercising his rights and duties as a member of the Church if he devotes his spare time to endless and fatuous commissions and committees calculated to refashion the Church in the image of the world! However, in the best progressive style the authors are not backward in praising themselves and their loyal 2-3%! "Yet, from this minority there has been a generous response. Most of them received their call through the organisations of the lay-apostolate *and could be considered an élite*" (our emphasis).

The Report and Religious

The spokesmen for this élite are not averse to giving advice to all and sundry, as has already been made clear in this article. After making sure that the bishops get down to their course in current affairs, they put forward what is presumably meant to be a practical plan to ensure that religious make the best use of their time and their talents. It is hard to decide whether the compilers of this passage derived their inspiration from fourth-rate Western novels or *The Wizard*; probably the former as when I used to read *The Wizard*, its style was generally a good few points higher than that of *The Church 2000*.

"In addition to full co-operation in the pastoral work which is already going on, it is also the function of religious to act as trail-blazers for the Church. So they must be expected to be in the forefront of new schemes". Which schemes? "They must be the first to try out new ways of serving the people in the world". Which new ways? "They must be unafraid to venture into uncharted areas of the world's progress". Read that one again — and again — and again!! "In all these ways" — which ways? — "they will have many opportunities to promote the interchange of knowledge between the Church and the world *and to help one to understand the other*". (our emphasis).

It is a useful exercise to go through the Report in this manner, sentence by sentence, in order to discover precisely what concrete proposals it does have to revitalise the Church in her mission. The answer will be, to misquote Macbeth, that *The Church 2000* is reminiscent of a tale told by an idiot, full of fuzz and waffle, signifying nothing.

The Report and Priests

And now a word for priests. Please stand to attention, Fathers, and bow low — preferably towards Mecca in

the interests of ecumenism. Fr. Hollings may be watching you.

"Priests will need training in their role of animators of the christian community and in their task of calling and sustaining lay men and women whose mission is to be the apostles of their own environment. Without such training men called to the priesthood may not be able to fulfil a primary function of their own ministry.

"Priests will need to be trained, not simply to speak and to listen, but also to recognise where and to whom they should be speaking and listening. This will mean that they will be constantly attentive to the voice of the Spirit and able to read the signs of the times through their interest in all that is happening in the world around them. It is good that they should have, or develop while in training, a field of interest which may lead to some degree of special competence arising out of special interest and experience" (Para 190).

Fine practical advice here for our overworked parish clergy! It might, in fact, be similar to the advice given by Pope Gregory to St. Augustine when he sent him to evangelise the Saxons, combined of course with the trail-blazing suggestions for the dialoguing religious. Somehow I doubt this!

Intolerant Authors

The Report concludes by expressing the hope that it will raise at least as many questions as it offers recommendations. As it has offered no recommendations of any practical value this should not be hard to do. It is also "offered in the hope that many people will be stimulated in their thinking about what the Church ought to be doing for the world in the years that lie ahead". The Authors request that the results of these discussions be sent to them for incorporation into a further and more wide-ranging report to be published later (Para 199). What the Authors mean, of course, is that

those who agree with the opinions expressed in this Report should write in and say so. Mgr. Buckley has expressed on their behalf great disappointment that, despite the thousands of free copies doled out at the expense of the laity in general, there has been very little interest in the Report at all⁽¹⁸⁾. No doubt the bishops will come to the rescue and ensure that their programmed pastoral councils and similar bodies provide the response the Authors require. The revised Report will then be hailed as a triumph of consultation and a great step forward on the road to the "even greater days" that lie ahead.

In a not too subtle hint to the bishops that they must fall into step with the progressive line, the Authors insist that "consultation does not simply mean asking people for their opinion. It is possible to do this without having the slightest intention of taking that opinion into account when the decision is actually made" (Para 80). The attitude of the Laity Commission to those who cannot be relied upon to toe the party line was made clear in 1973 when it replied with a point blank refusal to a request from the Pro Fide Movement to provide a member. While it considers it important to promote an "interchange of knowledge between the Church and the world and to help one to understand the other", there is, of course, no question of any such interchange of views with Catholics guilty of the new sin of orthodoxy. The Pro Fide Movement numbers among its members some of the most distinguished British Catholics and has received the special blessing of Pope Paul. An episcopal report has claimed, quite inaccurately, that the Laity Commission is "well representative of the various schools of thought in the Church", when, in fact, it represents only the views of the progressive élite. As the secretary of Pro Fide, Mr. E. W. Wade, M.B.E., has pointed out, the Laity Commission voted unanimously to join the British Council of

¹⁸ *Catholic Herald*, Oct. 12, 1973. 6,000 copies had been given away by this date and, in the two weeks up to this date, not a single reply has been received.

Churches; yet, there is certainly not unanimity on this point of view among "the various schools of thought within the Church." It can only be concluded that to be orthodox is to become a non-person, and non-persons cannot belong to a school of thought.

A Few Suggestions

As a response to the request for suggestions provoked by the Report, a few are appended here. It is hoped that readers who agree with them will put them forward to their own bishops as a matter of urgency — after reading the Report, of course⁽¹⁹⁾.

1. Stop worrying about *The Church 2000* and worry about the Church 1974, or there is unlikely to be any Church left to worry about in the year 2000.

2. Take immediate steps to ensure that orthodox doctrine is taught in all Catholic schools and teachers' training colleges. The doctrinal formation the teachers of tomorrow are receiving at present is as relevant to a career as a rodent operative as to that of a Catholic teacher.

3. Halt the destruction of the Roman Liturgy by forbidding any further experiments and innovations and insisting on a dignified celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. As a first and essential step towards this, at least one Mass each Sunday in every Church should be according to the unreformed Missal of St. Pius V. This will bring back some of the missing hundreds of thousands driven from our churches by the mundanity of the official reforms and the irreverence of the unofficial ones which followed it.

4. Insist on a disciplined and orthodox seminary formation for future priests. As Archbishop Lefebvre is proving with his seminary, this is the most effective way to attract students.

5. While behaving towards non-Catholics with courtesy

¹⁹ Available at 15p, post free.

and charity put an immediate stop to the rampant ecumania, which is ready to cast aside any and every article of Faith and traditional practice to placate the "separated brethren", who are making no similar concessions and, in any case, are declining into extinction at an escalating pace; a process which did not begin in our own case until we abandoned the preaching of the Gospel for incessant dialogues.

6. In the United States of America, the conservative Protestant Churches which refuse to enter into any ecumenical dialogues, and to modify the Gospel to placate the world, are growing at a pace which has been described as "like a prairie fire". The key-fact is that they have a *real* growth, i.e. they are growing at a faster rate than the general population. Let the Catholic Church in Britain also proclaim the Gospel in season and out of season without fear and without compromise; let her oppose each and every moral aberration from abortion, contraception and euthanasia to the tidal wave of pornography which is polluting our country. This will not only confirm the faith of Catholics but earn the respect and bring about the conversion of those outside the Church. The pathetic conversion figures of the "Church dialoguing" should by now have made it clear that it is not a Church which appeals to those still held in thrall by the world.

7. Let the social teaching of the Church be taught in our seminaries, schools, and colleges so that individual Catholics know the principles on which they must base their own attitude to politics and social justice, but let the bishops put an immediate stop to the pressures put upon them to take a "Catholic" stand on controversial political questions. Catholic social teaching will enable an informed Catholic to adopt a truly Christian attitude in his individual capacity to such problems as the revolution in Chile or the Portugese colonies in Africa. There is, however, no *official Catholic* position on such topics which our bishops can demand we should adopt. This is not the case with Communism which is intrinsically anti-Christian

and has been condemned by popes.

8. Let us place ourselves under the protection of Our Lady and take heed of the warnings she gave at Fatima. If our bishops lead the Catholic people of Britain in a return to the Rosary and we get down on our knees and begin praying frequently and fervently, God will give us the necessary grace to begin living in the way He wishes us to live. If 2-3% of Catholics begin doing this it could initiate a transformation of the Church which could then transform our society.

Spiritual Transformation Essential

If this spiritual transformation does not come about the consequences are too terrible to contemplate. The manuals for such a renewal are the *Bible*, the *Imitation* and the *Devout Life*. They have little to say about a pastoral strategy; but if the advice they contain is acted upon it will be found to *work*. We must, of course, pray for the Progressives and, above all, pray for our bishops. The bishops need our prayers and we need their leadership. They are the only men who can lead our Church back to sanity.

Malcolm Muggeridge has summed up the present insanity perfectly. "I am often asked", he writes, "whether it is true that I have been received into the Roman Catholic Church. It is very difficult for me to explain that the more enchanted I become with the person of Christ, the farther away I feel from this particular institution which, I consider, is now racing at breakneck speed to reproduce all the follies and fatuities of Protestantism, and will surely before long arrive at the same plight, with crazed clergy, empty churches, and total doctrinal confusion".

There is more sound comment in this one short paragraph than in the 199 cliché-ridden sections of *The Church* 2000. The response to Mr. Muggeridge's sound good sense is clear — put on the brakes and go into reverse. It will soon be too late.

NOTE

All the books and pamphlets for which prices have been given can be obtained from the Pro Fide Book Service, 39 Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey. Off-prints of this article can be obtained from this address or from the author, Michael Davies at 46, Blacklands Road, London, SE6 3AF. The cost per single copy is 8p post free or 50p per dozen copies (post free).

Faith

March/April contains a brilliant and scholarly repudiation of "The Agreed Statement of the Ministry". Please buy and read.

Single copies 18p (post free)

Annual subscription £1.10.

From Rev. Alan Wilders, 1 Kings Avenue, Rochester, Kent.

In the past, guarantees with goods have limited the rights of the consumer instead of protecting him. The law has been changed in this respect, but the supplier of services can still contract out of liability for many of the things that can go wrong — as some holiday makers have found out. This article examines such questions as misleading advertising and terms in contracts excluding liability.

Fairplay for the Consumer

J. M. JACKSON

THERE has been an increasing recognition in recent years of the need to protect the interests of consumers. In this article, I shall look particularly at such problems as the content of advertising and conditions of sale. Of course, at the present time, consumers are very much concerned about rising prices. The level of prices, however, is a subject in itself. For the present, we can assume that a consumer is free to choose whether a particular product is worth the price he is asked to pay for it. He can only make such a decision properly if he has not been misled about the quality or nature of the product and if he is not denied proper protection in the event of the product being defective.

Misleading Advertising

One must expect that advertising will extol the virtues of a product and will not point out its weaknesses. There is no reason to expect that many consumers will be seriously misled by extravagant claims that a particular brand is vastly superior to all its competitors. Of course, all the

competing brands make exactly the same kind of claim. A claim that one brand of detergent washes whiter than another is unlikely to prove seriously misleading. In any case, the expenditure involved in purchasing a packet of detergent is not large and the user will soon find out whether it does its job properly or not and, if necessary, switch to another brand. There can, however, be more seriously misleading advertisements. A holiday brochure for example, may claim that the hotel to be used has certain amenities and that it is within a few minutes' walk of a fine sandy beach.

An advertisement of this kind may attract a person to book such a holiday for himself and perhaps his family. The cost may be anything up to several hundred pounds for a family, and it is clearly a matter of importance that they should know exactly what they are being offered, and guaranteed that having decided what they want they should get it. It is in the nature of things that the holiday-maker will book a particular holiday because the advertisements have promised him those things he wants. If he has a family of young children, a sandy beach within easy reach of the hotel may be what he is looking for. If he finds that the beach is stony and perhaps half an hour's walk from the hotel, he will rightly feel that he has been deliberately deceived.

The Trade Description Act has now made such misleading advertisements an offence, and the complainants may also be able to recover some compensation. Nevertheless, it may still not be as easy for the aggrieved person to take effective action as it should be and it is by no means certain that he will always get adequate compensation. There remains, however, the more serious matter of the terms of the contract that is made between the holiday-maker and the firm providing the holiday. This is the general problem of the introduction of exclusion clauses into contracts for the supply of both goods and services — guarantees, for example, that restrict the customer's rights rather than protect him from defective goods.

The holidaymaker may read in the brochure that he will be accommodated in a particular hotel which is within two minutes' walk of a sandy beach. If he arrives at this hotel and finds it is an hour's walk to a beach, and a stony one at that, he will, as we have seen, have a cause for complaint under the Trade Description Act. Suppose, however, that the Hotel Splendide mentioned in the brochure is within two minutes' walk of the beach, but when he arrives at his destination he finds that he is taken to the Hotel Magnifico which is a thirty minute walk from the beach. The brochure has not misrepresented the location of the Hotel Splendide; what has happened is that the Hotel Splendide was mentioned in the brochure, the operator has chosen for some reason, good or ill, to send him to a different hotel, further away. Can he claim compensation in this case?

His prospects here are very doubtful, to say the least. He will probably find if he reads the booking conditions which he has signed (and he probably did not do so before signing) that these do not in fact require the tour operator to accommodate him in any particular hotel. This may be changed if circumstances require; indeed, he may be switched to a totally different location. Somebody who has booked a holiday in Spain or Italy may find that they are diverted to Malta for example. There are, of course, many reasons why such switches may be made. These reasons may include some which are quite beyond the control of the tour operators. For example, there was a recent situation when the Italian government stopped the supply of aviation fuel to British charter flights. In the face of such action, no tour operator can hope to honour the contracts he has made. On the other hand, there are occasions when the blame for the failure to provide what was originally offered should be placed firmly on the shoulders of the operator.

Such cases include the notorious overbooking of hotels. Some blame in such instances may also rest with the hotel owners. Nevertheless, it is the responsibility, or

should be, of operators to make sure that their own contracts with the hotel owners are watertight. If the owners fail to honour these contracts, then of course, it may be physically impossible for the tour operator to honour his. In this case, he should be forced to accept the consequences and compensate those holiday makers who have been let down and seek his own redress against the hotel owner.

One-sided Conditions

It may seem unreasonable to impose a liability for matters which may be beyond his control on the tour operator. On the other hand, these same operators do not agree that the holidaymaker should be able to break the contract with immunity if circumstances beyond his control prevent him going away when the time comes. If the holidaymaker is taken ill at the last minute or is perhaps prevented from reaching the airport by exceptional traffic conditions or even delayed by the necessity of making a statement to the police about an accident he has witnessed, he is expected to pay. He may be offered some kind of insurance against having to cancel, but even such insurance may be subject to its own exclusion clauses. The point for the moment is that if the holidaymaker is expected to insure against his liability in the event of having to cancel his holiday, surely the tour operator ought to do the same and not try to evade his liability by the introduction of exclusion clauses. It is no use saying that holidaymakers ought to make sure they understand what they are signing. Of course they should but given that many will not do this, and perhaps could not understand the booking conditions even if they did read them, there is a case for legal protection. Moreover, if a would-be-holidaymaker does not like the booking conditions of one operator, it is no use his looking at those of another. They are all likely to be very much the same. His choice is to accept these conditions or take some completely different kind of holiday.

The Measure of Compensation

If, in the kind of situations we have been looking at, a person feels he has been given something less than he paid for, how are we to measure the injury he has suffered and the proper level of compensation? This can never be simple. A great deal will depend up on the circumstances of individual cases. There will be some cases where there is an easy measure of the appropriate compensation for the failure to supply the goods or services contracted for. If one is supplied with a defective pair of shoes the customer may be happy to have them replaced, or if it appears that the design is such that they are not satisfactory for the purpose for which they were intended he is entitled to a refund of the price he paid.* There may be cases where the provision of defective goods incurs additional expense for the customer. If a new car is defective and off the road for a period the owner may need to hire a replacement. The cost of such hiring may be a proper measure of the compensation due to the car owner as well as the replacement of his car or the remedying of defects. In a recent case, a tyre company was held liable for the damage done to a coach which was damaged in an accident resulting from the failure of a defective tyre.

In these cases there may be a clear measure of the damage a person has sustained in being supplied with defective goods. If a holiday does not measure up to what he has been led to suspect, however, it may be more difficult. Take the case of somebody who is switched to a hotel half an hour from the beach instead of two minutes. This may be annoying for some people but the

* The customer, of course, can have no moral or legal claim where he has used goods for a purpose for which they were not intended, unless there were some circumstances in the situation which may have misled him about the nature of the goods and the purpose for which they were designed. He is entitled to believe that a pair of shoes is intended for ordinary outdoor use unless there is some indication to the contrary, but he could not complain if what was clearly an ordinary pair of shoes did not stand up to mountain walking or climbing in all kinds of country and weathers.

walk need not completely spoil the holiday. If frequent transport were provided between hotel and beach, then it might not matter except that if such transport had to be paid for the cost should properly be met by the operator. If infrequent transport were provided it would be a more serious loss in so far as anyone not really able to walk would be seriously deprived of the ability to use the beach as and when they wished. In some cases, the switch of hotels could be regarded as so serious as to mean that what was provided was worthless (for example, in the absence of adequate transport being provided, some holidaymakers might be virtually unable to leave the hotel). Similarly, if hotel amenities fall below the standards promised, this may be regarded as a minor matter (though still requiring some compensation) or as a complete failure to supply what was promised. Moreover, failures in this direction do not necessarily mean that the amenities provided are bad in themselves. Anyone booking a holiday in a five star hotel with the promise of an international cuisine will rightly believe that the contract they made has been completely repudiated if they are switched to a modest hotel with very limited menus, even though this may be an excellent hotel of its type.

Where the provision made falls so far short of the standards promised, then the holidaymaker is entitled in the first instance to the full refund of the price he has paid. This, however, is not enough. He has suffered the disappointment of not having the holiday he had booked and paid for. At the very least this should amount, in the case of a working man to the amount of his earnings for the duration of the holiday, so that he could, if convenient and he chose to do so, take the kind of holiday he wanted later without losing earnings by taking the extra time off.

The Present Position

It is obvious that at the present time millions of holidaymakers each year are fully satisfied. Only a

minority of holidays go wrong, and on the whole the holidaymakers are not treated as badly as the booking conditions would allow. Nevertheless, it is intolerable that the tour operators should be allowed to evade the legal burdens that should properly be theirs if they fail to honour the contracts they have made. Moreover, it is intolerable that the operators should be able to alter or curtail a holiday without even being obliged to refund in full any charges in respect of a cancelled portion of a holiday. The booking conditions of one well-known company contained the provision that the operator, in the event of having to curtail any holiday would refund any charges in respect of the cancelled portion after any additional costs had been met which arose from the cancellation. The refund in respect of the cancelled portion would not, of course, mean a quarter of the cost of a four-week holiday. It could be less than this because part of the cost, that of air or other transport is unrelated to the length of the holiday. But any additional costs incurred can be offset against any refunds. One could imagine a situation in which an operator is forced to curtail a holiday and is unable to obtain the normal kind of charter flight to bring his clients home. He may be forced to bring them back by scheduled airline flights which are much more expensive. The additional cost of the scheduled flight might mean that, far from getting a refund, the customer received an additional bill. This is not to say that holidaymakers are necessarily treated in this way. In the recent case of diversions from Italy to Malta the operators clearly met the additional costs involved themselves, but this is not enough. They should not be allowed to force people to accept the present booking conditions. The legal conditions should protect them from even the remote possibility of being unfairly treated, and indeed should ensure that any failure on the part of the operator or those on whom he relies should be accompanied by compensation.

Inevitably, having to pay substantial compensation when

things go wrong will put up the cost of holidays. If the proportion of real disasters is small, there is no reason to suppose that this would be a large increase. Even if it were, though, it is desirable that these exclusion clauses should be eliminated. Suppliers of goods or services should not be allowed to contract out of the ordinary liabilities they would otherwise have at common law. As stated already, they should not be in a position of being able to rely on the gullibility of those who could not understand the small print, even if they bothered to read it or the demand from those who want a particular service so strongly that they are prepared to gamble, knowing full well that the contract they are signing is one-sided. The law on guarantee on goods has been tightened up. It is high time the law relating to services was similarly changed.

CURRENT COMMENT

In the concluding article of this series, Father Crane considers the relationship between external circumstance, reverence in the liturgy and sacrifice; then, between liturgy and doctrine. His conclusion is that, in the New Mass, the element of Sacrifice, first played down, is now being eroded. From the angle of doctrine, it suits the progressive mood, which would substitute a community gathering for sacrifice to God.

Finally, it is important to note that the New Mass appears to have failed in what it set out to do.

The Old Mass

4: Liturgy, Sacrifice and Doctrine

THE EDITOR

I WROTE in a previous article that though the New Mass was certainly valid, there could be little doubt, I thought, but that some of those responsible for it had played down its sacrificial aspect to the point where it was in danger of becoming, even for many Catholics, no more than a communal meal. I did not write that it was anyone's intention to make it such; simply that, for many Catholics, it was in danger of becoming such. The two are not the same.

Losing Sight of the Sacrifice

I have no desire here to argue further as to whether this was deliberately intended by some of those who made

the New Mass or not. The thing to note, I believe, is that this is what appears most tragically to be happening to a good many Catholics in a good many places. And the reason, as I suggested in a previous article, is, firstly, the construction and wording of the New Mass itself.

Secondly, it is to be found in what are best called, perhaps, the external circumstances which, increasingly, are made to surround it. About these circumstances, I would say, there is little that invites reverence or mystery because they would appear essentially to be directly man-centred; directed, that is, towards communal participation and interchange. This was done, no doubt, from the worthy motive of emphasising the sacramental side of the Mass over and against the sacrificial which, as I have said, still remains in the New Mass, though in dimmed form. The original idea, I am sure, was to unite the Faithful at Mass more closely in Christ through the strengthening of its sacramental aspect. What appears to me personally to have happened in practice and at popular level, is that, in many cases, both people and priests have come to lose sight of the sacrificial side of the Mass more or less completely, or are in danger of doing so. As a result — as one looks at the sacramental side, which the New Mass was designed to enhance — the tendency in some quarters is for the New Mass to become little more than a communal meal. The reason, I think, is fairly clear when one thinks about it: if transubstantiation and, with it, the Sacrifice of Christ is left aside to the point of almost total non-advertence, the true Eucharistic Banquet, which should unite us in Christ, is gradually reduced in the mind of the congregation, to little more than a community celebration. And this, I believe myself, is what it is becoming in the minds of a fair number of priests, along with their congregations — in Holland, most certainly; to a large extent in France; in parts of the United States and, to a much lesser extent, here.

Two Points

This brings me, in this exercise in thinking out loud, to two rather important points. The first concerns the relationship between what may be called (not very aptly, but I can think of no other phrase) external circumstances and liturgical performance. The second has to do with the relationship between liturgy and doctrine and vice versa. I think it would be a good thing to take these points in order and expand on them a bit because I believe they are, really, very important in the context of these reflexions on the Old Mass and the New. I will begin with the first, which needs some time. The second can come later and be considered at much shorter length.

External Circumstances and Reverance

What follows is not an exercise in nostalgia, but I have to look back a bit if I am to get away to a good start with what I have to say about the interplay between external circumstances and liturgical performance. I remember how, when, as a young priest, I was preparing to say my first Mass, I was drilled most strictly and told to drill myself in such a way that every word and gesture of mine at the the altar of sacrifice should be exactly correct. Everything — tone of voice, blessings, bows, genuflexions, turn-rounds to the people, height and breadth at which one held extended arms — had to be as laid down in the rubrics, exactly correct. Why? Because, at the altar, one was performing the noblest action open to a human being; the sacrifice of God's Son to God. It followed, both logically and theologically, that one had to bring to it every ounce of reverence of which a human being was capable. And because human beings are made up of body and soul, it followed further that every word spoken, every bodily gesture undertaken had to be tuned in with the utmost reverence to this supreme act of worship, the highest to which any man could ever aspire. Human

nature being what it is, individual idiosyncrasies, would come out to take from reverence, if priests were left to themselves in the matter of words and gestures at Mass. It followed that idiosyncrasies had to be cut to a minimum. Hence, the rubrics, which bound all priests at Mass; depersonalizing them, so to say, in the interests of the reverence which men had to put forth when they offered sacrifice to God. How else could they acknowledge adequately in their hearts their total dependence on Him who had made them from nothing, except that they manifested it in every bodily gesture that was theirs at Mass? If the mouth speaks out of the fullness of the heart, the converse is also true; the heart is filled with reverence if the mouth of the celebrating priest is trained to speak with a reverential tone and the body to express itself in a whole series of dignified gestures. I do not think I need press the point. Man is not a desiccated calculating machine. He is a human being made up of body and soul. He worships with the whole of himself. Precisely for that reason the celebrating priest was never left to himself in the Old Mass. He was made to conform to a celebrating code; depersonalized in the interests of the dignity that had to surround supreme sacrifice. It has always been that way wherever men have offered sacrifice, paid honour where honour is due. After all, one does not go to see the Queen in an old pair of jeans and tatty tennis shoes. I think the point is made.

Trend Away from Reverence in the New

Now, with regard to the New Mass, I think it can be said that the priest is by no means so battered down with regard to tone and gestures as was the case with the Old. Far more scope is now left to him as an individual and in his new role as "President of the Assembly of the People of God" than was the case before. His is now, not only a more personal role; but he is set to face the people in the New Mass, with the result that personal

idiocyncrasy tends to be accentuated as it was not in the Old when he had his back to them. The general effect, I am sure, is such as to take from the awe that rightly goes with reverence and substitute for it the informal good-fellowship that goes with a gathering of friends. This may be ideal and admirable in itself: my thought here is that such an atmosphere is not conducive to the reverence — indeed, the awe — that goes with sacrifice. As a result, I believe many in the Church are losing sight of the Mass as a sacrifice and, in consequence, of the real and sacramental presence of Christ in Communion. Granted that this is the reality in their minds, what they are at is little more than a community meal. I trust I have not exaggerated. If I have done, I am sorry; but the tendency, I think, is certainly that way. This is why I wrote in the first article of this short series that many Catholics were uneasy about the New Mass because — in a way they could not explain, but only felt — it represented for them a radical departure from the old, something different, which they could not clearly explain, but which they sensed as a qualitative change that made them uneasy and which they knew in their bones would bring great harm to the Church.

Vernacular and Latin

And, of course — still on this first point of the relationship between external circumstance and liturgical performance — the whole trend away from reverence in the New Mass and so, from sacrifice has been accentuated by the stress laid on the vernacular and by the attempted imposition on congregations of a style of vocal and physical participation which derives from a faulty translation of the Latin word *actuosa*. What this word means in fact is the inner lifting of the heart and mind and not merely action by word and motion. But it has been taken almost universally in the latter sense and used, in consequence, as an argument for the almost universal imposition of

vernacular Masses at a time when Latin still remains, according to the Second Vatican Council, the official language of the liturgy of the Church. Under the circumstances, it is a little difficult always to be patient with those, who insist that the vernacular Mass is "in the spirit of Vatican II". It is most certainly not in the letter.

Vernacular, Participation and Irreverence

But I do not want to argue here; neither do I want to be sharp. I am trying to think out loud and I only hope I am not boring too many readers in the process. If I may get back to the vernacular and its use at Mass; it is said to be essential if those at Mass are to indulge in a certain type of participation, which derives from a faulty translation, as action by word and motion, of the Latin word "*actuosa*". In order to participate, it is argued one has to understand and understanding is through the vernacular. In order to answer this proposition, one has first to ask the question, participate in what? If it is a business discussion, or a class in school or the Mass as no more than a community celebration, I would agree; if it were a question of man-centred friendly interchange, I would agree. But the Mass is a matter of worship, man's supreme act of worship to God; and worship is not at all the same kind of thing as a business discussion; quite different from a friendly interchange. Mass is a Sacrifice, as well as a Sacrament; a matter, therefore, of awe and reverence, the prostration of man before God: in no way confined to the intellect, but a matter of stance and bearing and gesture; something that takes up the whole of oneself — body, soul, everything — in reverence before God. Here man engages the whole of himself, so to say, not merely his intellect, but his heart and all he is, offering, through and with the priest at the altar, the sacrifice of God's Son to God. Under such circumstances, the vernacular, to my way of thinking, becomes much more of a hindrance than a help, inducing ordinariness where awe

and wonder are required; descending to bathos when, for example, "Lazy Bones" is crooned at a requiem in the United States in place of the glories of the "*Dies Irae*". At such a point, I think, roots have gone: the road is open to chaos. And chaos is what we have been getting in a good many off-centre Masses these days. I do not want here to dwell on extremes. I want only to place before readers my view that the emphasis placed on the vernacular in the New Mass has combined, at popular level, with that placed also on a wrongly constricted notion of what participation means, to remove gradually from the minds of priest and people its sacrificial nature, and to move them little by little — and however subconsciously — towards the point where man's sacrifice to God will become no more than a community jamboree. Some, as I have said earlier, have reached this point already; others, I am afraid, have reached the area of near blasphemy. It is difficult to see where the process will end.

Unless very firm action is taken by Rome I feel sure that the Mass will be taken away from us as surely as it was taken away from our forefathers by Cranmer and the first Elizabeth. As Hugh Ross-Williamson has shown, there is a frightening similarity between the steps taken by Cranmer to destroy the Mass in England and the steps taken recently and continuing to be taken by Archbishop (as he now is) Bugnini and the Liturgical Commission to accommodate the New Mass to the supposed wishes of the Faithful and, as I believe personally, the claims of a bogus ecumenism, which would find unity in what seems to me to be the contrived ambiguity of the New Mass.

New Churches and Sacrifice

There is other supporting material that fits within this context of the relationship between external circumstance and liturgical performance. I have suggested so far that the liberty left to the priest in the New Mass, the use

of the vernacular and the emphasis laid on participation by word and gesture as distinct from that which is found far more fully in attentive recollection; these three factors have had the general effect of downgrading the notion of sacrifice in the New Mass and are liable to make it eventually in the minds of most congregations little more than a community meal. Further impulse in this direction is provided by the construction of new churches and the reconstruction of the old. This is done in the interests of the somewhat bogus, vernacularized participation referred to above; as a result, Catholic Churches are coming increasingly to resemble little more than man-centred community meeting places. The last thing one thinks of, on entering some of them nowadays, is that they have been built primarily in order that, within their walls, sacrifice may be offered to God. It is hard nowadays, particularly in a small, new Church structured with the New Mass in mind, to retain the notion that it is the House of God and not merely an up-to-date temple of man. This, I think, is what many Catholics mean when they say that contemporary churches are no longer "devotional"; and the whole effect is heightened when one finds the Blessed Sacrament stowed in a corner and the statues and stained glass of an older time whipped away and replaced with nothing. It is difficult to conceive of sacrifice in such a place, utterly devoid now of any atmosphere of reverence and mystery, which human beings — because made up of body and soul — must be helped to sense and feel as an aid to that reverence, which is the essential concomitant of sacrifice.

Table and Altar

And, finally, there is the table, which Cranmer, at the Reformation, cleverly introduced into Catholic Churches as a substitute for the altar and by way of an external aid essential to his evil design of erasing the Mass as a sacrifice and setting up in its place the Anglican memorial

meal. In this, over the years, he was completely successful, though he did not live to see his work come through to full fruition: be that as it may, belief in the Mass as a sacrifice — as such declared blasphemous in the thirty-nine articles of the Anglican Creed — was blurred to zero over the years in the minds of the English. The process is entirely understandable. What they saw prepared for them in their old churches, taken over by Cranmer for his new religion, was, first of all, no more than a memorial meal: inevitably, in time, it became no more than that in their minds. The process, as I have said, is entirely understandable: is there really any reason why, today within the Catholic Church, the process should not repeat itself? Weight is given to this thought when one realises that today, in some cases within the Church, the process has not merely repeated itself, but gone further — Cranmer's memorial meal has come and gone, to be replaced by a man-centred community celebration run on humanist lines. I hope and pray this process will be checked. I am not sure at the moment that it will be, at least for some time,

I have been considering so far and at very considerable length the first of two points made at the outset of this article: it was concerned with the relationship between external circumstance and liturgical performance. And I have just finished trying to show how the circumstances surrounding the New Mass are weighted against the reverence and the mystery that must be woven through any liturgy which enshrines man's worship of God in sacrifice. As a result, the notion of the New Mass as a sacrifice is going from the minds of many, to be replaced by that of a memorial and, in an increasing number of cases, no more than a community meal — a man-centred gathering in honour of man.

Liturgy and Doctrine

In this same context of the downgrading of the notion

of sacrifice, I want to consider, for a moment, the second point raised at the outset of this article: it is concerned with the relationship between liturgy and doctrine. This, thank God, is much easier to elucidate than the first and can be considered at much shorter length. For, it is obvious enough to begin with that men tend eventually, not merely in the liturgy, but in other departments of life, to think as they act. If a man's words and actions — as would appear to be the case in the New Mass — are directed away from sacrifice to God and in the direction of a meal shared with neighbours, it is very likely that, as time passes by, he will think of the Mass as a meal and not as a sacrifice; and begin, little by little, to take it as such. This is all that I am saying and I think it is true. It is so, as I have already remarked, in other departments of life: if a man grows careless about his manners, for example, he loses respect for his neighbours; they end up bereft of all dignity in his eyes. The doctrine of the Mass as Sacrifice as well as Sacrament can go from the mind in exactly the same way, if there is little liturgical inducement to regard it as such. In this way, liturgy works on doctrine.

And the thing can work the other way around. Heretical doctrine imposes a liturgy to suits its heresy, which is itself reinforced in its turn by the liturgy it produced in the first place: there is a boomerang effect in these things and it is cumulative. Thus, those in the Church today, for example, who think of Original Sin as no more than the difficulties of the human condition are forced logically to deny the Redemption and, with it, the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is the perpetuation, in an unbloody manner, of the Redeeming Sacrifice of Calvary. For them, the Mass can be no more than a community meal; and I regret that there are a good many priests and religious who think in this fashion in the contemporary Church. These would be pleased then, with the New Mass, not because those who made it up necessarily thought of it in this role, but because the man-centred nature of its ambiguous liturgy

lends itself easily to this interpretation. Again, those in the Church today who disregard the supernatural to the point, really, where it has lost all significance for them and who see the Church's role as that of a mere presence attendant on the advancement of a self-sufficient and secularist world, which has within itself all the means necessary for its own eventual and perfect happiness, which many of them identify with salvation; those in the Church who think in this fashion and see their Christian role as that of total involvement in such a world, these will make of the Mass no more than a secular meal in celebration of the progress of mankind: tragically, there is nothing in the New Mass which prevents them from using it in this fashion, and this is particularly true when it is celebrated in house; chaplaincy; or camp-fire; form; when jeaned celebrant and guitar- or gun-toting congregation take their readings from John F. Kennedy or Danny Berrigan, make up their own Canon and consecrate (?) a jug of wine and a loaf of bread. The liturgy of the New Mass, I am afraid, lends itself only too easily as a channel through which expression may be given only too easily to the heresy endemic in contemporary process- or development-theology, whether or not the latter be given still more specific expression in what is called, so unfortunately, the theology of liberation. It is thus no coincidence that the Catholic Left in the Church today — Liberationists, Revolutionaries, Utopians, Christian Marxists or whatever you like to call them — are also enthusiastic in their support for the New Mass. The reason is clear. What unites them is their secularism, their disregard — amounting to denial in most cases — of the supernatural; and they like the liturgy of the New Mass because it allows them so easily (though, Heaven knows, this was not the intention of its Authors) to make of what should be a Sacrifice as well as Sacrament, no more than a secular meal, a snack during off-hours in a perpetual revolution. You cannot do this kind of thing with the Old Mass and that is why, at this time particularly in the Church,

I think it essential to give it parity of esteem, at least, with the New.

The New Mass has Failed

There is a final point with which I would like to conclude this short series of articles on the Old Mass and the New. It is that the New has not succeeded in a single one of its central objectives, which appear to have been to stem the leakage, bring back the lapsed and, indeed, draw converts into the Church. It is now a little less than four years since the New Mass was introduced into the Church; yet, there is no sign that it has achieved any lasting success; on the contrary, it seems to me that its sole effect, really, has been to open the road still wider to anarchy. None of the objectives of its introduction have been obtained. Worse, the reverse has happened. We are further from attaining them than we were before the New Mass was introduced. In this country, certainly, the leakage from the Church has increased, the lapsed have not come back, the flow of converts is rapidly drying up and vocations to the priesthood and religious life are in poor shape. I am not saying that these unfortunate results are directly attributable to the New Mass alone; only that it has done nothing to put them right; and my own opinion certainly is that their continuation is by no means unconnected with it.

Diminished Numbers at Sunday Mass

So far as concerns attendance at Sunday Mass itself, a careful, unofficial inquiry made by a good friend of mine into attendance at Sunday Masses in the parishes of his London Diocese during the past seventeen years, revealed that almost every parish registered an *annual increase* in Mass attendance up to the inauguration of the New Mass. In the years that followed this inauguration there has been an *annual decrease* in 70% of the parishes and, of those

still registering an increase, only a handful are doing so at a higher rate than before the reform that gave us the New Mass. Moreover, in those cases which show a higher rate of increase than before, he insists that this is due not to the New Rite, but to the zeal and energy of the clergy who implement it. In other words, they would have had the same result within whatever rite they were working.

And not only in this London Diocese, but elsewhere as well. The same sort of result has occurred since the coming of the New Mass in the United States, Canada, Holland, Germany, and France unless I am very much mistaken. What, then, can be said? This, I am afraid; that Pope Paul's wish expressed so touchingly in 1964, when he prayed "That a popular liturgy may lead greater numbers to the Church" has most certainly not been fulfilled. In fact, the reverse has been the case. In this respect, therefore, as in others, I think it can be said not merely that the New Mass has been a failure, but that there is really no sign at all that it will ever prove anything else.

Under such circumstances, wisdom would seem to dictate, at the very least, that the Old Mass be called back into service to redress the balance rendered so dangerously unfavourable by the New. I call here for no substitution; merely that the one should be granted parity of esteem with the other; which its antiquity alone would seem to call for and which, so far as I can see, was all the Holy Father intended in the first place.

(Concluded)

One explanation of the unprecedented abandonment of the religious life by men and women is that many of them should never have been religious. Is this so? Why can't people be left alone during Mass to pray their own way?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Why can't people be left alone during Mass to pray their own way?

Because "aloneness" is the very opposite of the "togetherness" which is implied in our offering to God of the Sacrifice of Christ. We are one Body in Christ, Who is our Head. He is our one Priest offering Himself to the Father, as on Calvary, but now sharing His priesthood with His ministers and His people. The Mass is His act in which we join.

But I *do* join, you reply, only I join privately and in my own way.

Privately, in the sense of personally — that is as it should be. We are not just spectators silently thinking our own thoughts; we are actors, with parts to play, and speaking parts at that. We should be living our part, acting consciously as Members of Christ. His ministerial Members speak His words for Him, and perform His actions. His other Members assent, and also express their participation in words and actions. If, in a congregation at Mass, there were the desired intensity of awareness and a whole-hearted sharing, the union of minds and hearts would be perceptible from many signs. It is to that end of union that instruction should be directed by parents and other teachers. The various movements and postures of a con-

gregation would then be unifying rather than distracting — distraction would come from the varied non-conformity of those who stayed “alone”.

It is true, however, that the quiet of contemplation, the serenity which many enjoyed during the Latin Mass and which is shattered by what they call “bobbing up and down”, is also part of the Mass. The Second Vatican Council document on the liturgy says that during Mass there should be stretches of silence when the faithful can pray in their own way. You *are* provided for.

Are there any guiding principles for relationship with those who publicly despise the Church's teaching?

The only principle I can think of is that every person must be treated with charity and every case must be treated on its merits and demerits.

Our Lord said about one who will not make amends for an injustice he has manifestly perpetuated, “If he refuses to listen even to the church, let him be to you as a Gentile and a tax-collector” — one to be avoided; but even that clear instruction would have to be modified, in the spirit of Christ, where natural and supernatural ties remain though the teaching of the Church has been set at defiance. Supposing some member of a family has openly broken the Church's law or unrepentingly is here and now breaking it, the other members of the family continue to have their bonds and their obligations which cannot be honoured if the offender is avoided. There are so many different ways in which the Church's teaching is now despised — by the spreading of false doctrine, by secularizing the sacredness of priesthood and religious life, by divorce, abortion, contraception — even euthanasia. Where relationship must be maintained, as often it must be, rejection of disobedience and the particular evil it has led to must be clearly manifested to the offender, and, if possible, observers must not be allowed to suppose that

the offence is condoned. More prayer than ever would be owed to the member of the family who is out of the Church, or on the way out, or deprived of the Sacraments, or in false conscience. Other contributions to the well-being of the renegade or rebel would be suggested by circumstances — example would help, and perhaps persuasion; and charity and compassion can do nothing but good.

One explanation of the unprecedented abandonment of religious life by men and women is that many of them should never have been religious. Is that so?

There is a well-established and, I think, indestructible myth or superstition to the effect that all ordinary men and women have a near-perfect fitness for the married state. Just let them marry, and they will make a success of their marriage. The fact is that a great many men and women are not fit to marry anyone — and most of them are married. They suffer from some form of ingrained selfishness which has stayed with them for lack of, or in spite of, training; and they and their partner have to endure that defect, perhaps for a lifetime. Nevertheless, their contract of marriage was valid — they knew what it implied, and they subscribed to it freely. They themselves, at the time of their marriage, would have defended its validity against attacks on it, and would have insisted on their freedom to make it. When they and their partner discover how their failing robs marriage of its happiness, the remedy is for the pair to work together to remove or lessen the disability. No contract would be safe if theirs were broken because of notable hardship in fulfilling it.

There could well be religious, men and women, who, in character and temperament, are unfitted for community life. The purpose of novitiate, and of the time of probation between first vows and final profession, is to find their unfitness and let them go. If it remains undiscovered until

their valid contract of final vows has been made, then they and those who have to live with them must make the best of a bad job. To dispense them is to sap the will of all the others who have a struggle overcoming themselves in order to make a happiness of religious life.

How true is it that "power tends to corrupt"?

As a general statement it can stand, with no softening. The possession of any kind of power, physical, mental or social, is at once accompanied by feelings of self-satisfaction, because power does in some way enlarge its possessor, and so it gives a sense of well-being. That sense stimulates and strengthens the human tendency to be turned inwards on self and to attribute to self any personal abilities and successes. In proportion as one is concentrated on self one loses attention to others, and the person becomes unbalanced, ingrowing and corrupt.

St. Paul asks, "What have you that you have not received?" Our Lord told Pilate, "You would have no power over me unless it had been given you from above". The parable of the talents teaches us both the source and the purpose of such qualities and positions as we have. They come to us from God and are to be used in His service. We are entrusted with them, and as trustees we are answerable for our use of them. Power, when we are conscious of having it, should give us not complacency or a glow of satisfaction, but a spasm of fear that we should misuse the gifts of God and have to be ashamed when we give an account of our stewardship.

But the responsibility of talents has to be borne. The danger of missing them is not met by wrapping them in a cloth and burying them. Non-use can easily be misuse. Authority, which is power over others, must be duly exercised or those under it are deprived of one of the necessities of their lives. The power, ultimately, is God's; and to remember that fact would prevent the selfishness which corrupts the wielder of power.

Book Reviews

Shorts

It is not too difficult to see why Cardinal Ottaviani consented to write a foreword to this most useful, brief life of Pope St. Pius V. (*St. Pius V* by Robin Anderson; St. Michael's Press; no price stated), For this great Pope, who had to cope with Christendom in disintegration at the time of the Reformation, brought to the task of restoration a firmness and decisiveness in action which, to many at least, seem sadly lacking in the Church today. Cardinal Ottaviani finds little, I think, that pleases him in the contemporary stance of the Church. He, like many others, will look back to the saintly vigour of Pope St. Pius and contrast it unfavourably with what seems, again to many, to be the timidity with which the Church is facing the problems that beset her at a time of crisis very similar to that of the Reformation. In fact, I would go so far as to say that the publication of this brief book, particularly its third chapter, could well be a way, used by someone high in the Church, who loves it and who is distressed at its present state of affairs, of telling the Vatican obliquely of his fears; of imploring it, without delay, to take strong action against the enemies within the Church who are eroding its very foundations, to act firmly, decisively and fearlessly before it is too late. Certainly, the similarity of conditions between the Reformation and the present day is startling, to put it mildly. This book is intended at base, I believe, to bring out, by implication, the contrast between the methods used then and now by the Vatican for the restoration of the Faith. It is well worth reading on this account alone.

Readers of Tito Casini's *The Last Mass of Paul VI*, which was reviewed some time ago in these pages, will enjoy *The Torn Tunic*, which was published some years before it, in 1967 (Britons Publishing Company; 50p). Faced with what seemed to him the utter destructiveness

of contemporary liturgical reform, Casini held his pen for a while, hoping as so many of us have hoped, that the day would come when enough would be called enough; when the awful business of unending liturgical milling-about would be over and done with. It was not to be. Casini could stand it no longer. He let loose his blast, aimed primarily at the progressive Cardinal of Bologna, who appeared to him as presiding, almost gleefully, over the destruction of the Church's great liturgical heritage. Neither has the process stopped. Only the other day, yet another decree appeared — stoked up, no doubt, by the indefatigable Archbishop Bugnini — which, if I interpret it aright, will soon allow private enterprisers in the Church to draw up their own Eucharistic Prayers. This will mean, as I see it, the final nail in the coffin of the Mass, as we have known and loved it over the centuries and for which our martyrs died.

I still cannot get over it, cannot understand it; that anyone should dare to play such havoc with something not merely so sacred, but carved out of the tradition of the centuries. The end of the current process, of course, can only be, not a new liturgy, but no liturgy — with everyone doing his own grotesque thing and, everywhere, beauty in ruins about us. It was this, interestingly enough, that Pope St. Pius V found, when he got to the papal throne at the time of the Reformation. In answer, he enforced a uniform liturgy in the interests of unity of Faith, more vital than ever at the time of the Reformation. In our own day, the Liturgical Commission has done the exact opposite, imposing a pluriform liturgy, wrecking the heritage of the centuries in the interests of I really don't know what. If we are to judge by the results of this performance, we can only conclude that the liturgical reform has been an appalling failure. It is not too late to return to the ways of the past. Tito Casini's immensely powerful open letter is as compelling a plea as any I have come across that the Church should do this without delay.

Paul Crane, S.J.